arXiv:1412.8399v2 [math.CO] 30 Dec 2014

YES, THE MISSING AXIOM OF MATROID THEORY IS LOST FOREVER

DILLON MAYHEW, MIKE NEWMAN, AND GEOFF WHITTLE

Abstract. We prove there is no sentence in the monadic second-order language MS_0 that characterises when a matroid is representable over at least one field, and no sentence that characterises when a matroid is $\mathbb{K}$-representable, for any infinite field $\mathbb{K}$. By way of contrast, because Rota's Conjecture is true, there is a sentence that characterises $\mathbb{F}$-representable matroids, for any finite field $\mathbb{F}$.

1. Introduction

A matroid captures the notion of a discrete collection of points in space. Sometimes these points can be assigned coordinates in a consistent way, and sometimes they cannot. The problem of characterising when a matroid is *representable* has been the prime motivating force in matroid research since Whitney's founding paper [9].

Plenty of effort has been invested in characterising matroid representability via excluded minors. Less attention has been paid to the prospect of characterisating representability via axioms. Perhaps this is because of Vámos's well-known article [8], which has been interpreted as stating that no such characterisation is possible (see [2]). In [5], we pointed out that the possibility of characterising representable matroids in the language of Whitney's axioms was still open; that, in other words, it was still not proved that "the missing axiom of matroid theory is lost forever", *contra* Vámos's title. We conjectured that in fact there was no such characterisation, and we made some partial progress towards resolving the conjecture by showing that it was impossible to characterise the class of representable matroids, or the class of matroids representable over an infinite field, using a logical language based on the rank function. However, that language imposed quite strong constraints on the form of quantification. In this article, we present a language with no such constraints, and we prove that it is impossible to characterise representability, or representability over an infinite field, in this more natural language.

The language that we develop is a form of monadic second-order logic, MS_0. As we show in Section 2, MS_0 is expressive enough to state the matroid axioms, and to state when a matroid contains an isomorphic copy of a fixed minor. This means that any minor-closed class of matroids can

Date: December 31, 2014.

be characterised with a sentence in MS_0, as long as it has a finite number of excluded minors. In particular, since Rota's Conjecture has been positively resolved by Geelen, Gerards, and Whittle (see [3]), it follows that the class of $\mathbb{F}$-representable matroids can be characterised by a sentence in MS_0, whenever $\mathbb{F}$ is a finite field. Our main results show that this is not the case for the class of matroids that are representable over at least one field, nor for the class of $\mathbb{K}$-representable matroids, when $\mathbb{K}$ is any infinite field.

We say that a matroid is *representable* if it is representable over at least one field.

Theorem 1.1. *There is no sentence, ψ, in MS_0, such that a matroid is representable if and only if it satisfies ψ.*

Theorem 1.2. *Let $\mathbb{K}$ be any infinite field. There is no sentence, $\psi_{\mathbb{K}}$, in MS_0, such that a matroid is $\mathbb{K}$-representable if and only if it satisfies $\psi_{\mathbb{K}}$.*

These theorems may seem stronger than those in [5], but in fact the results are independent of each other. The logical language used in [5] had constraints on quantification, unlike MS_0, but it also had access to the rank function, and to the arithmetic of the integers, while MS_0 does not.

Theorems 1.1 and 1.2 follow easily from the next two lemmas. Let k be a positive integer. Define $g_1(k, 0)$ to be

$$3^k 2^{k(k+1)},$$

and recursively define $g_1(k, i+1)$ to be $2^{g_1(k,i)}$. Let $f_1(k)$ be $g_1(k, k)$. Thus $f_1(k)$ is

$$2^{2^{2^{\cdot^{\cdot^{\cdot^{2^{3^k 2^{k(k+1)}}}}}}}}$$

where the tower of exponents has height $k+1$. Recall that if M and M' are matroids with disjoint ground sets, then $M \oplus M'$ is the *direct sum* of M and M'.

Lemma 1.3. *Let k be a positive integer. There is a partition of the set of matroids into blocks, $P_1, \ldots, P_{N_1(k)}$, such that $N_1(k) \leq f_1(k)$ and the following property holds: for any sentence, ψ, in MS_0 with k variables, whenever M and M' are matroids that belong to the same block, then, for any matroid, M'', either $M \oplus M''$ and $M' \oplus M''$ both satisfy ψ, or neither satisfies ψ.*

By using Lemma 1.3, we can easily deduce Theorem 1.1.

Proof of Theorem 1.1. Assume that there is a sentence, ψ, in MS_0, that characterises representable matroids. Let k be the number of variables in ψ, and let $P_1, \ldots, P_{N_1(k)}$ be the partition provided by Lemma 1.3. Because there are infinitely many prime numbers, we can let p and p' be distinct primes such that the projective planes $M = \mathrm{PG}(2, p)$ and $M' = \mathrm{PG}(2, p')$ belong to the same block. Now, setting M'' to be M, we see that either

$\mathrm{PG}(2,p) \oplus \mathrm{PG}(2,p)$ and $\mathrm{PG}(2,p') \oplus \mathrm{PG}(2,p)$ both satisfy ψ, or neither satisfies ψ. In either case we have a contradiction, since the first of these direct sums is a representable matroid, and the second is not. □

Let k be a positive integer. We say that matroids M and M' are *equivalent* if, for any sentence ψ with k variables, and any matroid M'', either both $M \oplus M''$ and $M' \oplus M''$ satisfy ψ, or neither do. Lemma 1.3 shows that this equivalence relation has finite index for any k. In this way, the proof of Theorem 1.1 is reminiscent of the Myhill-Nerode characterisation of regular languages (see [6] or [1, Section 6.1]). By way of contrast, the theorem in [5] used a proof technique that was essentially an Ehrenfeucht-Fraïssé game (see [1, Section 2.2]).

For every k, there is a partition of matroids into finitely many blocks, such that two matroids from the same block satisfy exactly the same k-variable sentences. This follows from Lemma 1.3 by letting M'' be the empty matroid $U_{0,0}$, or from the fact that there are only finitely many *rank-k 0-types* (see [4, Section 3.4] for an explanation).

For the next lemma, we construct families of matroids by using gain graphs. Loosely, a gain graph is a graph equipped with edge labels that come from a group. For each such graph, there is a gain-graphic matroid, whose ground set is the edge set of the graph. In Section 5, we introduce two families of gain graphs. A *hoop matroid* is the gain-graphic matroid that corresponds to a gain graph of the form $\Gamma(\mathbb{K}, \alpha, s)$. Here $\mathbb{K}$ is a field, $s \geq 3$ is an integer, and α is a non-zero element of $\mathbb{K}$ with order greater than s. The edge labels of the gain graph $\Gamma(\mathbb{K}, \alpha, s)$ come from the multiplicative group of $\mathbb{K}$. We also introduce a family of gain graphs, $\Delta(\mathbb{L}, \beta, t)$. In this case $\mathbb{L}$ is a field, $t \geq 3$ is an integer, and β is a non-zero element with order greater than $2t(t-1)$. A *loop matroid* is gain-graphic, corresponding to a gain graph of the form $\Delta(\mathbb{L}, \beta, t)$.

If M is a hoop matroid, corresponding to the gain graph $\Gamma(\mathbb{K}, \alpha, s)$, and M'' is the loop matroid of $\Delta(\mathbb{L}, \beta, t)$, then M and M'' can be glued together along a rank-2 flat, to form an amalgam of the two matroids. The resulting matroid is denoted $\mathrm{Amal}(M, M'')$. In the case that $\mathbb{K} = \mathbb{L}$ and $\alpha = \beta$, where the order of α is greater than $\max\{s, 2t(t-1)\}$, then both M and M'' can be represented over $\mathbb{K}$, but $\mathrm{Amal}(M, M'')$ can be represented over $\mathbb{K}$ if and only if $s = t$. This means that the following lemma quickly leads to a proof of Theorem 1.2, with hoop matroids playing the same role that projective planes did in the proof of Theorem 1.1. Details of the proof will be left until the end of the paper. If k is a positive integer, then $g_2(k, 0)$ is $2^{k^2}3^k17^k$, and $g_2(k, i+1)$ is $2^{g_2(k,i)}$. Define $f_2(k)$ to be $g_2(k, k)$

Lemma 1.4. *Let k be a positive integer. There is a partition of the set of hoop matroids into blocks, $P_1, \ldots, P_{N_2(k)}$, such that $N_2(k) \leq f_2(k)$ and the following property holds: for any sentence, ψ, in MS_0 with k variables, whenever M and M' are hoop matroids that belong to the same block and*

M'' is a loop matroid, when $\mathrm{Amal}(M, M'')$ *and* $\mathrm{Amal}(M', M'')$ *are defined, either both satisfy ψ, or neither satisfies ψ.*

Lemma 1.4 also implies the following (unsurprising) fact: using MS_0 to characterise increasingly large finite fields requires increasingly large sentences.

Corollary 1.5. *There is no integer, N, such that, for every finite field, $\mathbb{F}$, there is a sentence, $\psi_{\mathbb{F}}$, in MS_0 containing at most N variables, with the property that a matroid is $\mathbb{F}$-representable if and only if it satisfies $\psi_{\mathbb{F}}$.*

In fact Lemma 1.4 is sufficient to prove both Theorem 1.1 and Theorem 1.2, since, if $\mathrm{Amal}(M, M'')$ is not representable over the field $\mathbb{K}$, then it is not representable over any field (Lemma 5.3). However, we feel that Lemma 1.3 is more intuitive, and also interesting in its own right, so we prefer to prove that lemma, and then note the easy changes required to produce a proof of Lemma 1.4.

For all matroid essentials we refer to Oxley [7].

2. Monadic second-order logic

We construct the logical language MS_0 for making statements about matroids. It includes an unlimited supply of variables, $X_1, X_2, X_3, \ldots$ along with the binary predicate, $\subseteq$, the unary predicates, Sing and Ind, as well as the standard connectives $\wedge$ and $\neg$, and the quantifiers $\exists$ and $\forall$. The variables will be interpreted as representing subsets of a ground set. Thus $X_i \subseteq X_j$ is interpreted as the statement that X_i is a subset of X_j and $\mathrm{Sing}(X_i)$ is interpreted as the statement that X_i has cardinality equal to one. Moreover, $\mathrm{Ind}(X_i)$ is interpreted as the statement that X_i is independent in a given matroid.

We recursively define formulas in MS_0, and simultaneously define their sets of variables. The following statements define expressions known as *atomic formulas*.

(1) $X_i \subseteq X_j$ is an atomic formula, for any variables X_i and X_j, and $\mathrm{Var}(X_i \subseteq X_j) = \{X_i, X_j\}$.
(2) $\mathrm{Sing}(X_i)$ is an atomic formula, for any variable X_i, and $\mathrm{Var}(\mathrm{Sing}(X_i)) = \{X_i\}$.
(3) $\mathrm{Ind}(X_i)$ is an atomic formula, for any variable X_i, and $\mathrm{Var}(\mathrm{Ind}(X_i)) = \{X_i\}$.

A *formula* is an expression generated by a finite application of the following rules. Every formula has an associated set of variables and *free variables*:

(1) Every atomic formula, ψ, is a formula, and $\mathrm{Fr}(\psi) = \mathrm{Var}(\psi)$.
(2) If ψ is a formula, then $\neg\psi$ is a formula, and $\mathrm{Var}(\neg\psi) = \mathrm{Var}(\psi)$, while $\mathrm{Fr}(\neg\psi) = \mathrm{Fr}(\psi)$.
(3) If ψ_1 and ψ_2 are formulas, and $\mathrm{Fr}(\psi_i) \cap (\mathrm{Var}(\psi_j) - \mathrm{Fr}(\psi_j)) = \emptyset$ for $\{i, j\} = \{1, 2\}$, then $\psi_1 \wedge \psi_2$ is a formula, and $\mathrm{Var}(\psi_1 \wedge \psi_2) = \mathrm{Var}(\psi_1) \cup \mathrm{Var}(\psi_2)$, while $\mathrm{Fr}(\psi_1 \wedge \psi_2) = \mathrm{Fr}(\psi_1) \cup \mathrm{Fr}(\psi_2)$.

(4) If ψ is a formula and $X_i \in \mathrm{Fr}(\psi)$, then $\exists X_i\psi$ and $\forall X_i\psi$ are formulas, and $\mathrm{Var}(\exists X_i\psi) = \mathrm{Var}(\forall X_i\psi) = \mathrm{Var}(\psi)$, while $\mathrm{Fr}(\exists X_i\psi) = \mathrm{Fr}(\forall X_i\psi) = \mathrm{Fr}(\psi) - \{X_i\}$.

A variable in $\mathrm{Var}(\psi)$ is *free* if it is in $\mathrm{Fr}(\psi)$, and *bound* otherwise. A formula is *quantifier-free* if all of its variables are free, and is a *sentence* if all its variables are bound. Rule (3) insists that no variable can be free in one of ψ_1 and ψ_2 and bound in the other, if $\psi_1 \wedge \psi_2$ is to be a formula. We can overcome this constraint if necessary by relabelling the bound variables in a formula.

We use $X \nsubseteq Y$ as shorthand for $\neg(X \subseteq Y)$. We use the shorthand $\psi_1 \vee \psi_2$ to mean $\neg((\neg\psi_1)\wedge(\neg\psi_2))$ and we use $\psi_1 \rightarrow \psi_2$ to mean $(\neg\psi_1)\vee\psi_2$. Likewise, we use $\psi_1 \leftrightarrow \psi_2$ to mean $(\psi_1 \rightarrow \psi_2) \wedge (\psi_2 \rightarrow \psi_1)$.

Next we spend some time illustrating the expressive power of MS_0. It is powerful enough to state the axioms for matroids, and to characterise when a matroid contains a fixed minor.

If $t \geq 2$ is an integer, we use $\mathrm{Union}_t(X_{i_1}, \ldots, X_{i_t}, X_{i_{t+1}})$ as shorthand for the statement

$$\forall X\ \mathrm{Sing}(X) \rightarrow (X \subseteq X_{i_{t+1}} \leftrightarrow \bigvee_{1\leq j\leq t} X \subseteq X_{i_j}).$$

Thus $\mathrm{Union}_t(X_{i_1}, \ldots, X_{i_t}, X_{i_{t+1}})$ is interpreted as being true if and only if $X_{i_{t+1}}$ is equal to $X_{i_1} \cup \cdots \cup X_{i_t}$. (The variable X stands for some variable not equal to any of $X_{i_1}, \ldots, X_{i_{t+1}}$.) Now we let the predicate $\mathrm{Max}(X_i)$ stand for

$$\mathrm{Ind}(X_i) \wedge (\forall X\ \mathrm{Sing}(X) \wedge X \nsubseteq X_i \rightarrow \forall Y\ (\mathrm{Union}_2(X_i, X, Y) \rightarrow \neg\mathrm{Ind}(Y))).$$

Thus $\mathrm{Max}(X_i)$ is interpreted as the statement that X_i is maximal with respect to satisfying the predicate Ind.

The family of sets on which the predicate Ind returns 'true' is the collection of independent sets of a matroid if and only the following sentences are satisfied:

I1. $\exists X_1\ \mathrm{Ind}(X_1)$
I2. $\forall X_1 \forall X_2\ \mathrm{Ind}(X_1) \wedge X_2 \subseteq X_1 \rightarrow \mathrm{Ind}(X_2)$
I3. $\forall X_1 \forall X_2\ \mathrm{Max}(X_1) \wedge \mathrm{Ind}(X_2) \wedge \neg\mathrm{Max}(X_2) \rightarrow$
$\exists X_3\ \mathrm{Sing}(X_3) \wedge X_3 \subseteq X_1 \wedge X_3 \nsubseteq X_2 \wedge$
$\forall X_4\ \mathrm{Union}_2(X_2, X_3, X_4) \rightarrow \mathrm{Ind}(X_4)$

Next we let N be a fixed matroid on the ground set $\{1, \ldots, n\}$, with $\mathcal{I}$ as its collection of independent sets. Let $\mathcal{D}$ be the set of dependent subsets of N. A matroid has a minor isomorphic to N if and only if it contains distinct elements $x_1, \ldots, x_n$, and an independent set, X_{n+1}, such that $\{x_1, \ldots, x_n\} \cap X_{n+1} = \emptyset$, and $\{x_{i_1}, \ldots, x_{i_t}\} \cup X_{n+1}$ is independent precisely when $\{i_1, \ldots, i_t\}$ is an independent set of N. In this case, N is isomorphic to the minor produced by contracting X_{n+1} and restricting to the set $\{x_1, \ldots, x_n\}$. Thus we see that a matroid has a minor isomorphic to

N if and only if it satisfies the following sentence:

$$\exists X_1 \cdots \exists X_n \exists X_{n+1} \bigwedge_{1 \leq i \leq n} (\mathrm{Sing}(X_i) \wedge X_i \nsubseteq X_{n+1}) \wedge \mathrm{Ind}(X_{n+1})$$
$$\wedge \bigwedge_{1 \leq i < j \leq n} X_i \nsubseteq X_j$$
$$\wedge \bigwedge_{\{i_1,\ldots,i_t\} \in \mathcal{I}} (\forall X \ \mathrm{Union}_{t+1}(X_{i_1}, \ldots, X_{i_t}, X_{n+1}, X) \rightarrow \mathrm{Ind}(X))$$
$$\wedge \bigwedge_{\{i_1,\ldots,i_t\} \in \mathcal{D}} (\forall X \ \mathrm{Union}_{t+1}(X_{i_1}, \ldots, X_{i_t}, X_{n+1}, X) \rightarrow \neg \mathrm{Ind}(X))$$

3. Proof of Lemma 1.3

Throughout this section we let k be a fixed positive integer. Recall that $g_1(k,0)$ is $3^k 2^{k(k+1)}$, and that $g_1(k,i+1)$ is $2^{g_1(k,i)}$, while $f_1(k)$ is $g_1(k,k)$.

A *registry* is a $(k+2) \times k$ matrix with rows indexed by Ind, Sing, and $X_1, \ldots, X_k$, and columns indexed by $X_1, \ldots, X_k$. An entry in row Ind or in row X_i must be 'T' or 'F'. An entry in row indexed by Sing is either '$<$', '$=$', or '$>$'. It follows that there are at most $g_1(k,0) = 3^k 2^{k(k+1)}$ possible registries.

An *l-stacked matroid* is a tuple, $(M, Y_1, \ldots, Y_l)$, where M is a matroid, $0 \leq l \leq k$, and each Y_i is a subset of the ground set of M. Note that each matroid, M, is also a 0-stacked matroid, (M). We define a *depth-0 tree* to be a registry. Recursively, a *depth-$(i+1)$ tree* is a non-empty set of depth-i trees. If $\mathcal{T}$ is a depth-$(i+1)$ tree, then the depth-i trees it contains are its *children*. Note that we can use an easy inductive argument to show there are no more than $g_1(k, i+1)$ depth-$(i+1)$ trees, and hence no more than $f_1(k)$ depth-k trees.

To each l-stacked matroid, $\mathcal{M} = (M, Y_1, \ldots, Y_l)$, we associate a depth-$(k-l)$ tree, $\mathcal{T}(\mathcal{M})$. Thus each matroid is associated with a depth-k tree. A k-stacked matroid, $(M, Y_1, \ldots, Y_k)$ corresponds to a depth-0 tree, which is a registry. Informally, we think of this registry as containing information about the truth values of the statements $\mathrm{Sing}(Y_i)$, $\mathrm{Ind}(Y_i)$, and $Y_i \subseteq Y_j$. If $\mathcal{M} = (M, Y_1, \ldots, Y_l)$ is an l-stacked matroid, then the *children* of $\mathcal{M}$ are the $(l+1)$-stacked matroids of the form $(M, Y_1, \ldots, Y_l, Y_{l+1})$, where Y_{l+1} ranges over all subsets of the ground set of M. We are going to define $\mathcal{T}(\mathcal{M})$ so that its children are exactly the trees corresponding to the children of $\mathcal{M}$. So, for example, if $\mathcal{M} = (M, Y_1, \ldots, Y_{k-1})$, then $\mathcal{T}(\mathcal{M})$ contains information about the truth values of the atomic formulas for all possible assignments of the variable X_k. It follows inductively that if $\mathcal{M} = (M)$ is a 0-stacked matroid, the depth-k tree $\mathcal{T}(\mathcal{M})$ contains information about the truth value of all possible atomic formulas, for all possible assignments of the variables $X_1, \ldots, X_k$.

Formally, we first define $\mathcal{T}(\mathcal{M})$ in the case that $l = k$. Then $\mathcal{T}(\mathcal{M})$ is a depth-0 tree (a registry). The entry of $\mathcal{T}(\mathcal{M})$ in row Ind and column X_i is

'T' if and only if Y_i is independent in M. The entry in row X_i and column X_j is 'T' if and only if $Y_i \subseteq Y_j$. Finally, the entry in row Sing and column X_i is '$<$', '$=$', or '$>$', according to whether $|Y_i|$ is less than, equal to, or greater than one. When $l < k$, we recursively define $\mathcal{T}(\mathcal{M})$ to be the set

$$\{\mathcal{T}(M, Y_1, \ldots, Y_l, Y_{l+1}) \colon Y_{l+1} \subseteq E(M)\}.$$

In other words, we let Y_{l+1} range over all subsets of the ground set $E(M)$, while keeping $Y_1, \ldots, Y_l$ fixed. This produces a collection of $(l+1)$-stacked matroids, each of which is thus associated with a depth-$(k-l-1)$ tree. We define the set of these trees to be the depth-$(k-l)$ tree associated with $\mathcal{M}$.

Now let $\mathcal{B}$ be the set of $(k+2) \times k$ matrices with rows indexed by Ind, Sing, and $X_1, \ldots, X_k$, and columns indexed by $X_1, \ldots, X_k$, where each entry is either 'T' or 'F'. Thus a matrix in $\mathcal{B}$ records the truth values of the predicates $\mathrm{Ind}(X_i)$, $\mathrm{Sing}(X_i)$, and $X_i \subseteq X_j$ for a particular set-system. If ψ' is a quantifier-free formula in MS_0, then ψ' is logically equivalent to a boolean expression in the predicates $\mathrm{Sing}(X_i)$, $\mathrm{Ind}(X_i)$, and $X_i \subseteq X_j$. Hence we can consider any such quantifier-free formula to be a function from $\mathcal{B}$ to $\{\mathrm{T}, \mathrm{F}\}$.

Next we define an operation that takes pairs of registries into $\mathcal{B}$. The *sum* of two registries is produced by simply summing the two matrices, entry by entry, under the following summation rules:

$+$	T	F
T	T	F
F	F	F

$+$	$<$	$=$	$>$
$<$	F	T	F
$=$	T	F	F
$>$	F	F	F

Notice that we have constructed these summing operations so that, if $\mathcal{M} = (M, Y_1, \ldots, Y_k)$ and $\mathcal{M}' = (M', Y_1', \ldots, Y_k')$, where M and M' have disjoint ground sets, then in the sum of $\mathcal{T}(\mathcal{M})$ and $\mathcal{T}(\mathcal{M}')$, the entry in column X_j, and row Ind, Sing, or X_i is 'T' if and only if, respectively, $Y_j \cup Y_j'$ is independent in $M \oplus M'$, $|Y_j \cup Y_j'| = 1$, or $Y_i \cup Y_i' \subseteq Y_j \cup Y_j'$.

Let ψ be a formula in MS_0 using k variables. By relabelling, we can assume that $\mathrm{Var}(\psi) = \{X_1, \ldots, X_k\}$. Let l be the number of free variables in ψ. By relabelling we can assume that $\mathrm{Fr}(\psi) = \{X_1, \ldots, X_l\}$. We can also assume that ψ is in *prenex normal form*. That is,

$$\psi = Q_{l+1} X_{l+1} Q_{l+2} X_{l+2} \cdots Q_k X_k \ \psi'$$

where each Q_i is either $\exists$ or $\forall$, and ψ' is a quantifier-free formula in MS_0 with $\mathrm{Var}(\psi') = \{X_1, \ldots, X_k\}$. We now define what it means for a pair of depth-$(k-l)$-trees, $\mathcal{T}$ and $\mathcal{T}'$, to be *compatible* (relative to ψ).

In the case that $l = k$, then ψ is quantifier-free, and $\mathcal{T}$ and $\mathcal{T}'$ are a pair of registries. We say that this pair is compatible if and only if their sum is taken to 'T' by the quantifier-free formula ψ. (Remembering that ψ is a function from $\mathcal{B}$ to $\{\mathrm{T}, \mathrm{F}\}$.)

Now assume that $l < k$. Thus $\mathcal{T}$ and $\mathcal{T}'$ are non-empty sets of depth-$(k-l-1)$ trees. First consider the case that $Q_{l+1} = \exists$. Then $\mathcal{T}$ and $\mathcal{T}'$ are

compatible if and only if $\mathcal{T}$ contains a depth-$(k-l-1)$ tree, $\mathcal{T}_0$, and $\mathcal{T}'$ contains a depth-$(k-l-1)$ tree, $\mathcal{T}_0'$, such that $\mathcal{T}_0$ and $\mathcal{T}_0'$ are compatible relative to the formula

$$Q_{l+2}X_{l+2}\cdots Q_kX_k\ \psi'.$$

Similarly, if $Q_{l+1} = \forall$, we say that $\mathcal{T}$ and $\mathcal{T}'$ are compatible if and only if $\mathcal{T}_0$ and $\mathcal{T}_0'$ are compatible relative to

$$Q_{l+2}X_{l+2}\cdots Q_kX_k\ \psi'$$

for every depth-$(k-l-1)$ tree, $\mathcal{T}_0$, contained in $\mathcal{T}$, and every depth-$(k-l-1)$ tree, $\mathcal{T}_0'$, contained in $\mathcal{T}'$.

An l-stacked matroid, $(M, Y_1, \ldots, Y_l)$, *satisfies* ψ if M satisfies ψ when each free variable, $X_i \in \{X_1, \ldots, X_l\}$, is interpreted as Y_i.

Proposition 3.1. *Let $\mathcal{M} = (M, Y_1, \ldots, Y_l)$ and $\mathcal{M}' = (M', Y_1', \ldots, Y_l')$ be l-stacked matroids, where M and M' have disjoint ground sets. Then the l-stacked matroid $(M \oplus M', Y_1 \cup Y_1', \ldots, Y_l \cup Y_l')$ satisfies ψ if and only if the trees, $\mathcal{T}(\mathcal{M})$ and $\mathcal{T}(\mathcal{M}')$, are compatible relative to ψ.*

Proof. Note that $\mathcal{T}(\mathcal{M})$ and $\mathcal{T}(\mathcal{M}')$ are depth-$(k-l)$ trees. First assume that $l = k$, so that ψ is a quantifier-free formula. Then $\mathcal{T}(\mathcal{M})$ and $\mathcal{T}(\mathcal{M}')$ are depth-0 trees, that is, registries. Let ω be the matrix in $\mathcal{B}$ that is produced by summing $\mathcal{T}(\mathcal{M})$ and $\mathcal{T}(\mathcal{M}')$. As we have noted, the entry of ω in row X_i and column X_j is 'T' if and only if $Y_i \subseteq Y_j$ and $Y_i' \subseteq Y_j'$; that is, if and only if $Y_i \cup Y_i' \subseteq Y_j \cup Y_j'$. Similarly, the entry of ω in row Ind and column X_i is 'T' if and only if Y_i is independent in M and Y_i' is independent in M'; that is, if and only if $Y_i \cup Y_i'$ is independent in $M \oplus M'$. Finally, the entry in row Sing and column X_i is 'T' if and only if $|Y_i \cup Y_i'| = 1$. Thus ω encodes the truth values of all the statements $X_i \subseteq X_j$, $\mathrm{Ind}(X_i)$, and $\mathrm{Sing}(X_i)$, when each X_i is interpreted as the subset $Y_i \cup Y_i'$ of the matroid $M \oplus M'$. Now $\mathcal{T}(\mathcal{M})$ and $\mathcal{T}(\mathcal{M}')$ are compatible relative to ψ if and only if ω is taken to 'T' by the quantifier-free formula ψ, which is true if and only if $(M \oplus M', Y_1 \cup Y_1', \ldots, Y_l \cup Y_l')$ satisfies ψ. This establishes the base case of the proof.

Next we assume that $l < k$. Consider the case that $Q_{l+1} = \exists$. Then $\mathcal{T}(\mathcal{M})$ and $\mathcal{T}(\mathcal{M}')$ are compatible relative to ψ if and only if there are depth-$(k-l-1)$ trees $\mathcal{T}_0 \in \mathcal{T}(\mathcal{M})$ and $\mathcal{T}_0' \in \mathcal{T}(\mathcal{M}')$ such that $\mathcal{T}_0$ and $\mathcal{T}_0'$ are compatible relative to

$$Q_{l+2}X_{l+2}\cdots Q_kX_k\ \psi'.$$

Now $\mathcal{T}_0$ is equal to $\mathcal{T}(M, Y_1, \ldots, Y_l, Y_{l+1})$ for some choice of subset $Y_{l+1} \subseteq E(M)$, and $\mathcal{T}_0'$ is equal to $\mathcal{T}(M', Y_1', \ldots, Y_l', Y_{l+1}')$ for some choice of $Y_{l+1}' \subseteq E(M')$. By induction, $\mathcal{T}_0$ and $\mathcal{T}_0'$ are compatible relative to $Q_{l+2}X_{l+2}\cdots Q_kX_k\ \psi'$ if and only if

$$(M \oplus M', Y_1 \cup Y_1', \ldots, Y_l \cup Y_l', Y_{l+1} \cup Y_{l+1}')$$

satisfies $Q_{l+2}X_{l+2}\cdots Q_kX_k\ \psi'$. But this is true if and only if there exists a subset $Y_{l+1}\cup Y'_{l+1}$, where $Y_{l+1}\subseteq E(M)$ and $Y'_{l+1}\subseteq E(M')$, such that $Q_{l+2}X_{l+2}\cdots Q_kX_k\ \psi'$ is true when each X_i is interpreted as $Y_i\cup Y'_i$, for $i\in\{1,\ldots,l+1\}$. In other words, if and only if $\exists X_{l+1}Q_{l+2}X_{l+2}\cdots Q_kX_k\ \psi'$ is true. Since this formula is equal to ψ, this completes the proof when $Q_{l+1}=\exists$.

Assume that $Q_{l+1}=\forall$. Then $\mathcal{T}(\mathcal{M})$ and $\mathcal{T}(\mathcal{M}')$ are compatible relative to ψ if and only if, for all depth-$(k-l-1)$ trees $\mathcal{T}_0\in\mathcal{T}(\mathcal{M})$ and $\mathcal{T}'_0\in\mathcal{T}(\mathcal{M}')$, $\mathcal{T}_0$ and $\mathcal{T}'_0$ are compatible relative to $Q_{l+2}X_{l+2}\cdots Q_kX_k\ \psi'$. By induction, this is true if and only if, for every choice of subset $Y_{l+1}\subseteq E(M)$, and for every choice of $Y'_{l+1}\subseteq E(M')$, the $(l+1)$-stacked matroid,

$$(M\oplus M', Y_1\cup Y'_1,\ldots,Y_l\cup Y'_l, Y_{l+1}\cup Y'_{l+1}),$$

satisfies $Q_{l+2}X_{l+2}\cdots Q_kX_k\ \psi'$. This, in turn, is true if and only if $Q_{l+2}X_{l+2}\cdots Q_kX_k\ \psi'$ is true when each X_i is interpreted as $Y_i\cup Y'_i$ for $i\in\{1,\ldots,l+1\}$, for every subset $Y_{l+1}\cup Y'_{l+1}$ such that $Y_{l+1}\subseteq E(M)$ and $Y'_{l+1}\subseteq E(M')$. In other words, if and only if $\forall X_{l+1}Q_{l+2}X_{l+2}\cdots Q_kX_k\ \psi'$ is true. This completes the proof. □

Proof of Lemma 1.3. For any two labelled matroids, M and M', let $\mathcal{M}=(M)$ and $\mathcal{M}'=(M')$ be the corresponding 0-stacked matroids. We define M and M' to be *equivalent* if the depth-k trees, $\mathcal{T}(\mathcal{M})$ and $\mathcal{T}(\mathcal{M}')$, are identical. This equivalence relation partitions labelled matroids into $N_1(k)$ blocks, $P_1,\ldots,P_{N_1(k)}$, where $N_1(k)$ is at most the number of depth-k trees. Thus $N_1(k)\leq f_1(k)$.

Now let ψ be a sentence in MS_0 using k variables. By relabelling and using standard techniques, we assume that $\psi=Q_1X_1\cdots Q_kX_k\ \psi'$. Let M and M' be matroids that belong to the same block, and let M'' be an arbitrary matroid. Let $\mathcal{M}''=(M'')$ be the corresponding stacked matroid. Now Proposition 3.1 says that $M\oplus M''$ satisfies ψ if and only if $\mathcal{T}(\mathcal{M}'')$ is compatible with $\mathcal{T}(\mathcal{M})$ relative to ψ. As $\mathcal{T}(\mathcal{M})=\mathcal{T}(\mathcal{M}')$, this is true if and only if $\mathcal{T}(\mathcal{M}'')$ is compatible with $\mathcal{T}(\mathcal{M}')$, which is true if and only if $M'\oplus M''$ satisfies ψ. This completes the proof of Lemma 1.3. □

4. Amalgams

Let M_1 and M_2 be simple matroids with ground sets E_1 and E_2, rank functions r_1 and r_2, and closure operators cl_1 and cl_2. Let ℓ be $E_1\cap E_2$, where we assume that $M_1|\ell=M_2|\ell$. A matroid, M, on the ground set $E_1\cup E_2$ is an *amalgam* of M_1 and M_2 if $M|E_1=M_1$ and $M|E_2=M_2$. If $M_1|\ell$ is a modular matroid (meaning $r(F)+r(F')=r(F\cap F')+r(F\cup F')$ for every pair of flats, F and F', in $M_1|\ell$), then [7, Theorem 11.4.10] implies that

$$(1)\quad r(X)=\min\{r_1(Y\cap E_1)+r_2(Y\cap E_2)-r_1(Y\cap\ell)\ :\ X\subseteq Y\subseteq E_1\cup E_2\}$$

is the rank function of an amalgam of M_1 and M_2, known as the *proper amalgam*. We denote this amalgam by $\mathrm{Amal}(M_1, M_2)$. Henceforth, we consider only the case that $r_1(\ell) = 2$. Since every rank-2 uniform matroid is modular, this means that $M_1|\ell$ is modular, so that $\mathrm{Amal}(M_1, M_2)$ is defined.

Proposition 4.1. *Assume that M_i is a simple matroid with ground set E_i, rank function r_i, and closure operator cl_i, for $i = 1, 2$. Let $\ell = E_1 \cap E_2$, where $M_1|\ell = M_2|\ell$ and $r_1(\ell) = 2$. Let X be a subset of $E_1 \cup E_2$. If $X \cap E_1$ is dependent in M_1, or if $X \cap E_2$ is dependent in M_2, then X is dependent in $\mathrm{Amal}(M_1, M_2)$. If $X \cap E_1$ is independent in M_1 and $X \cap E_2$ is independent in M_2, then X is dependent in $\mathrm{Amal}(M_1, M_2)$ if and only if*

(i) *$\ell \subseteq \mathrm{cl}_1(X \cap E_1)$ and $r_2((X - E_1) \cup \ell) < r_2(X - E_1) + 2$,*
(ii) *$\ell \subseteq \mathrm{cl}_2(X \cap E_2)$ and $r_1((X - E_2) \cup \ell) < r_1(X - E_2) + 2$, or*
(iii) *there is an element $y \in \ell$ such that $y \in \mathrm{cl}_1(X - E_2) \cap \mathrm{cl}_2(X - E_1)$.*

Proof. If $X \cap E_1$ is dependent in M_1, then $X \cap E_1$ is dependent in $\mathrm{Amal}(M_1, M_2)$, since $\mathrm{Amal}(M_1, M_2)|E_1 = M_1$. By symmetry, X is dependent in $\mathrm{Amal}(M_1, M_2)$ if $X \cap E_1$ is dependent in M_1 or if $X \cap E_2$ is dependent in M_2. Henceforth we assume that $X \cap E_1$ is independent in M_1 and $X \cap E_2$ is independent in M_2.

Assume statement (i) holds. Let Y be $X \cup \ell$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} |X| &= |X \cap E_1| + |X - E_1| \\ &= r_1(X \cap E_1) + r_2(X - E_1) \\ &> r_1(X \cap E_1) + r_2((X - E_1) \cup \ell) - 2 \\ &= r_1(Y \cap E_1) + r_2(Y \cap E_2) - r_1(Y \cap \ell), \end{aligned}$$

so by (1), the rank of X in $\mathrm{Amal}(M_1, M_2)$ is less than $|X|$, as desired. By symmetric arguments, we see that if (i) or (ii) holds, then X is dependent in $\mathrm{Amal}(M_1, M_2)$.

Next we assume that (iii) holds. Since $X \cap E_1$ contains no circuits of M_1 it follows that y is not in X. If $X \cap \ell$ contains distinct elements, u and v, then by performing circuit exchange on $\{y, u, v\}$ and a circuit contained in $(X - E_2) \cup y$ that contains y, we obtain a circuit of M_1 contained in $X \cap E_1$. This contradiction means that $|X \cap \ell| \in \{0, 1\}$. Let Y be $X \cup y$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} |X| &= |X \cap E_1| + |X \cap E_2| - |X \cap \ell| \\ &= r_1(X \cap E_1) + r_2(X \cap E_2) - |X \cap \ell| \\ &= r_1(Y \cap E_1) + r_2(Y \cap E_2) - (r_1(Y \cap \ell) - 1) \\ &> r_1(Y \cap E_1) + r_2(Y \cap E_2) - r_1(Y \cap \ell). \end{aligned}$$

Again we see that X is dependent in $\mathrm{Amal}(M_1, M_2)$, and this completes the proof of the 'if' direction.

For the 'only if' direction, we assume that X is dependent in $\mathrm{Amal}(M_1, M_2)$. As $X \cap E_1$ is independent in M_1 and $X \cap E_2$ is independent in M_2, it follows that X is contained in neither E_1 nor E_2. There is some set

Y such that $X \subseteq Y \subseteq E_1 \cup E_2$ and $|X| > r_1(Y \cap E_1) + r_2(Y \cap E_2) - r_1(Y \cap \ell)$. Assume that amongst all such sets, Y has been chosen so that it is as small as possible. If y is an element in $Y - (X \cup E_2)$, then we could replace Y with $Y - y$. Therefore no such element exists. By symmetry it follows that $Y - X \subseteq \ell$. If $Y = X$, then $Y \cap E_1$ is independent in M_1 and $Y \cap E_2$ is independent in M_2, so $|X| > r_1(Y \cap E_1) + r_2(Y \cap E_2) - r_1(Y \cap \ell) = |Y| = |X|$. This contradiction means that there is an element, y, in $Y - X$. The minimality of Y means that

$$\begin{aligned} r_1(Y \cap E_1) + r_2(Y \cap E_2) - r_1(Y \cap \ell) \\ < r_1((Y - y) \cap E_1) + r_2((Y - y) \cap E_2) - r_1((Y - y) \cap \ell). \end{aligned}$$

It follows that y is in $\mathrm{cl}_1((Y - y) \cap E_1)$ and $\mathrm{cl}_2((Y - y) \cap E_2)$, but not $\mathrm{cl}_1((Y - y) \cap \ell)$. We combine the observations in this paragraph to deduce that $|X \cap \ell| < |Y \cap \ell| < 3$.

Assume that $|X \cap \ell| = 1$, so that $|Y \cap \ell| = 2$ and $Y = X \cup y$. Let x be the element in $X \cap \ell$. Since $\mathrm{cl}_1(X \cap E_1) = \mathrm{cl}_1((Y - y) \cap E_1)$ contains x and y, it contains ℓ. As y is in $\mathrm{cl}_2((X - E_1) \cup x)$, it follows that $r_2((X - E_1) \cup \ell) = r_2((X - E_1) \cup x) < r_2(X - E_1) + 2$. Therefore statement (i) holds.

Now we assume that $|X \cap \ell| = 0$. If $Y \cap \ell = \{y\}$, then $Y = X \cup y$, and y is in

$$\mathrm{cl}_1((Y - y) \cap E_1) \cap \mathrm{cl}_2((Y - y) \cap E_2) = \mathrm{cl}_1(X - E_2) \cap \mathrm{cl}_2(X - E_1),$$

so statement (iii) holds. Therefore we assume that $Y \cap \ell = \{y, y'\}$, and hence $Y = X \cup \{y, y'\}$. Earlier statements imply that

$$\begin{aligned} y \in \mathrm{cl}_1((X \cap E_1) \cup y') \cap \mathrm{cl}_2((X \cap E_2) \cup y') \quad \text{and} \\ y' \in \mathrm{cl}_1((X \cap E_1) \cup y) \cap \mathrm{cl}_2((X \cap E_2) \cup y). \end{aligned}$$

If $X \cap E_1$ is a flat of M_1, and $X \cap E_2$ is a flat of M_2, then $r_1(Y \cap E_1) = r_1((X \cap E_1) \cup y) = r_1(X \cap E_1) + 1$. Similarly, $r_2(Y \cap E_2) = r_2(X \cap E_2) + 1$. But this means that

$$r_1(Y \cap E_1) + r_2(Y \cap E_2) - r_1(Y \cap \ell) = r_1(X \cap E_1) + r_2(X \cap E_2) = |X|,$$

which is a contradiction. Now, by using symmetry, we can assume that y is in $\mathrm{cl}_1(X \cap E_1)$. This means that y', and hence ℓ, is contained in $\mathrm{cl}_1(X \cap E_1)$. Also,

$$r_2((X - E_1) \cup \ell) = r_2((X - E_1) \cup y) < r_2(X - E_1) + 2$$

so statement (i) holds, and the proof is complete. □

5. Gain-graphic matroids

Next we introduce two families of matroids via gain graphs. If G is an undirected graph (possibly containing loops and multiple edges) with edge

set E and vertex set V, then $A(G)$ is the following subset of $E \times V \times V$:

$$\{(e,u,v)\colon e \text{ is a non-loop edge joining } u \text{ and } v\} \cup \{(e,u,u)\colon e \text{ is a loop incident with } u\}.$$

A *gain graph* (over the group H) is a pair (G,σ), where G is a graph, and σ is a function from $A(G)$ to H, such that $\sigma(e,u,v) = \sigma(e,v,u)^{-1}$ for every non-loop edge e with end-vertices u and v. We say that σ is a *gain function*. If $C = v_0e_0v_1e_2\cdots e_tv_{t+1}$ is a cycle of G, where $v_0 = v_{t+1}$, then $\sigma(C)$ is defined to be

$$\sigma(e_0,v_0,v_1)\sigma(e_1,v_1,v_2)\cdots\sigma(e_t,v_t,v_{t+1}).$$

Note that, in general, H may be nonabelian, and the value of $\sigma(C)$ depends on the choice of starting point and orientation for C; however, if $\sigma(C)$ is equal to the identity of H, then this equality will hold no matter which starting point and orientation we choose. In this case, we say that C is *balanced*. A cycle that is not balanced is *unbalanced*.

The *gain-graphic* matroid $M(G,\sigma)$ has the edge set of G as its ground set. The circuits of $M(G,\sigma)$ are exactly the edge sets of balanced cycles, along with the minimal edge sets that induce connected subgraphs containing at least two unbalanced cycles and no balanced cycles. Any such subgraph is either a *theta graph*, or a *handcuff*. The former consists of two vertices joined by three internally-disjoint paths; the latter is two edge-disjoint cycles joined by a single path, which intersects the cycles only in its end-vertices. Note that this path may have length zero, in which case the two cycles share a single vertex.

Assume that (G,σ) is a gain graph, where σ takes $A(G)$ to the multiplicative group of a field, $\mathbb{K}$. Let $v_1,\ldots,v_m$ and $e_1,\ldots,e_n$ be orderings of the vertex and edge sets of G. We define a matrix, $D(G,\sigma)$, with entries from $\mathbb{K}$. The rows of $D(G,\sigma)$ are labelled by $v_1,\ldots,v_m$ and the columns are labelled by $e_1,\ldots,e_n$. If e_i is a balanced loop, then column e_i contains all zeroes. If e_i is an unbalanced loop, let v_j be the vertex incident with e_i; then column e_i contains a 1 in row v_j, and zeroes in every other row. Now assume that e_i joins v_j and v_k, where $j<k$. Column e_i contains a 1 in row v_j, and the entry in row v_k is $-\sigma(e_i,v_j,v_k)$. All other entries in the column are zero.

Proposition 5.1 (Theorem 2.1 of [10])**.** *Let (G,σ) be a gain graph over the multiplicative group of the field $\mathbb{K}$. The matrix $D(G,\sigma)$ represents the matroid $M(G,\sigma)$ over $\mathbb{K}$.*

Next we construct two families of gain graphs. Let $s \geq 3$ be an integer, and let $\mathbb{K}$ be a field containing a non-zero element, α, with order greater than s. The gain graph $\Gamma(\mathbb{K},s,\alpha)$ has vertex set $\{u_1,\ldots,u_{s+1}\}$. Each vertex u_i in $\{u_2,\ldots,u_s\}$ is incident with a loop, a_i. In addition, u_1 is incident with the loop a, and u_{s+1} is incident with the loop b. The parallel edges x_i and y_i join u_i and u_{i+1} for each i in $\{1,\ldots,s\}$. Moreover, the

edges x, y, and z join u_1 and u_{s+1}. The gain function, σ, will be into the multiplicative group of $\mathbb{K}$. We define σ so that it takes each loop to α and each x_i to 1. Furthermore, $\sigma(y_i, u_i, u_{i+1}) = \alpha$ for each i in $\{1, \ldots, s\}$, while $\sigma(x, u_1, u_{s+1}) = 1$, $\sigma(y, u_1, u_{s+1}) = \alpha^{s-1}$, and $\sigma(z, u_1, u_{s+1}) = \alpha^s$. A gain-graphic matroid of the form $M(\Gamma(\mathbb{K}, s, \alpha))$ is said to be a *hoop matroid*.

Now let $t \geq 3$ be an integer. We let $\mathbb{L}$ be a field, and we let β be an element in $\mathbb{L} - \{0\}$ with order greater than $2t(t-1)$. We construct the gain graph $\Delta(\mathbb{L}, t, \beta)$. It has $\{v_1, \ldots, v_{2t}\}$ as its vertex set. Each vertex $v_i \in \{v_2, \ldots, v_{2t-1}\}$ is incident with a loop, b_i, while v_1 is incident with the loop a and v_{2t} is incident with the loop b. For each $i \in \{1, \ldots, 2t-1\}$, the edges e_i and f_i join v_i to v_{i+1}. The edges x, y, z, and g join the vertices v_1 and v_{2t}. The gain function takes each loop to β, and each edge e_i to 1. The triple (f_i, v_i, v_{i+1}) is taken to β^{t-1} when $i \in \{1, \ldots, t\}$, and to β^t when $i \in \{t+1, \ldots, 2t-1\}$. Thus t of the edges $f_1, \ldots, f_{2t-1}$ receive the label β^{t-1}, and the other $t-1$ receive the label β^t. The values of $\sigma(x, v_1, v_{2t})$, $\sigma(y, v_1, v_{2t})$, $\sigma(z, v_1, v_{2t})$, and $\sigma(g, v_1, v_{2t})$ are 1, β^{t-1}, β^t, and $\beta^{t(t-1)}$, respectively. A gain-graphic matroid of the form $M(\Delta(\mathbb{L}, t, \beta))$ is a *loop matroid*.

Figure 1 shows $\Gamma(\mathbb{K}, s, \alpha)$ and $\Delta(\mathbb{L}, t, \beta)$. The edge labels of loops have been omitted. Every edge label corresponds to the orientation of the edge shown in the drawing.



FIGURE 1. The gain graphs $\Gamma(\mathbb{K}, s, \alpha)$ and $\Delta(\mathbb{L}, t, \beta)$.

Note that whenever $M = M(\Gamma(\mathbb{K}, s, \alpha))$ and $M' = M(\Delta(\mathbb{L}, t, \beta))$, then $E(M) \cap E(M') = \{a, b, x, y, z\}$. Let ℓ be this intersection. Then $M|\ell$ and $M'|\ell$ are both isomorphic to $U_{2,5}$, so $\mathrm{Amal}(M, M')$ is defined.

If G is a graph and X is a set of edges, then $G[X]$ denotes the subgraph of G containing the edges in X and all vertices that are incident with at least one edge in X.

Lemma 5.2. *Let $\mathbb{K}$ be a field, let $s \geq 3$ be an integer, and let α be an element in $\mathbb{K} - \{0\}$ with order greater than $2s(s-1)$. Let M be $M(\Gamma(\mathbb{K}, s, \alpha))$ and let M' be $M(\Delta(\mathbb{K}, s, \alpha))$. Then $\mathrm{Amal}(M, M')$ is $\mathbb{K}$-representable.*

Proof. Let ℓ be $\{a, b, x, y, z\}$. Let (G, σ) be the signed graph $\Gamma(\mathbb{K}, s, \alpha)$, and let (G', σ') be $\Delta(\mathbb{K}, s, \alpha)$. The lemma will follow from Proposition 5.1 if we can prove that $\mathrm{Amal}(M, M')$ is gain-graphic and corresponds to a gain graph over the multiplicative group of $\mathbb{K}$. To this end, we construct a gain graph by gluing together G and G'. We identify the vertices u_1 and v_1, as well as u_{s+1} and v_{2s}. Let H be the resulting graph. Note that $\sigma \cup \sigma'$ is a gain function for H. Let N be the gain-graphic matroid $M(H, \sigma \cup \sigma')$. Thus we can prove the lemma by checking that N and $\mathrm{Amal}(M, M')$ are equal. We do this by showing that a set, X, is dependent in N if and only if it is dependent in $\mathrm{Amal}(M, M')$. Note that N is obviously an amalgam of M and M'.

For the first direction, we assume that X is a circuit in N. As N is an amalgam of M and M', we assume that X is contained in neither $E(M)$ nor $E(M')$. We start by considering the case that X is a balanced cycle in $(H, \sigma \cup \sigma')$. If X contains an edge joining u_1 and u_{s+1}, then this edge is g, and $H[X]$ contains a path with vertex sequence $u_1, u_2, \ldots, u_{s+1}$, for otherwise X is contained in $E(M)$ or $E(M')$. The product of edge labels along this path is α^j, where $j \leq s$. We also require that $\alpha^j = \alpha^{s(s-1)}$, since g is labelled with $\alpha^{s(s-1)}$, and X is a balanced cycle. But $\alpha^j = \alpha^{s(s-1)}$ cannot hold, as α has order greater than $2s(s-1)$, and $s \geq 3$ so $s(s-1) > s$. Therefore we conclude that X does not contain any edge between u_1 and u_{s+1}. Let α^j be the product of edge labels along the path in $H[X]$ with vertex sequence $u_1, u_2, \ldots, u_{s+1}$. Thus $0 \leq j \leq s$. Let $\alpha^{p(s-1)+qs}$ be the product of edge labels along the path in $H[X]$ with vertex sequence $v_1, v_2, \ldots, v_{2s}$, where p and q are non-negative integers. Thus $0 \leq p(s-1) + qs \leq 2s(s-1)$ and $\alpha^j = \alpha^{p(s-1)+qs}$, as X is balanced. As the order of α is greater than $2s(s-1)$, we deduce that $j = p(s-1) + qs$, and hence j is equal to 0, $s-1$, or s. In these three cases, x, y, or z is an element in $\mathrm{cl}_M(X - E(M')) \cap \mathrm{cl}_{M'}(X - E(M))$. Thus statement (iii) of Proposition 4.1 holds, so X is dependent in $\mathrm{Amal}(M, M')$.

Now we can assume that X does not contain a balanced cycle of $(H, \sigma \cup \sigma')$. Thus $H[X]$ is a theta graph or a handcuff. Let $\{M_1, M_2\}$ be $\{M, M'\}$. Assume that $H[X - E(M_1)]$ is a path from $u_1 = v_1$ to $u_{s+1} = v_{2s}$. None of the internal vertices of this path has degree three or more in $H[X]$. From this, we can see without difficulty that $H[X \cap E(M_1)]$ contains a unbalanced cycle joined by a path to the loop a, and a cycle joined by a path to the loop b. Therefore $\{a, b\}$ (and hence all of ℓ) is contained in $\mathrm{cl}_{M_1}(X \cap E(M_1))$. Also, $H[(X - E(M_1)) \cup \{a, b\}]$ is a handcuff, and hence $(X - E(M_1)) \cup \{a, b\}$

is a circuit of M_2 that spans ℓ. This means that $r_{M_2}((X - E(M_1)) \cup \ell) < r_{M_2}(X - E(M_1)) + 2$. Now (i) of Proposition 4.1 holds, so X is dependent in $\mathrm{Amal}(M, M')$.

We can now assume that neither $H[X - E(M)]$ nor $H[X - E(M')]$ is a path from $u_1 = v_1$ to $u_{s+1} = v_{2s}$. Assume $H[X - E(M)]$ is a forest. As $H[X]$ has no vertices of degree one, the forest must be a path, and its end-vertices must be $u_1 = v_1$ and $u_{s+1} = v_{2s}$, contradicting our assumption. By symmetry, it follows that each of $H[X - E(M)]$ and $H[X - E(M')]$ contains an unbalanced cycle. Since $H[X]$ is connected, either u_1 or u_{s+1} is on a path from one of these cycles to the other. Let us assume the former, since the latter case is identical. Now a is in a handcuff, and hence in a circuit of M that is contained in $(X - E(M')) \cup a$, and also in a circuit of M' that is contained in $(X - E(M)) \cup a$. Thus statement (iii) of Proposition 4.1 holds, and X is dependent in $\mathrm{Amal}(M, M')$. We have proved that if X is dependent in N, it is dependent in $\mathrm{Amal}(M, M')$.

For the other direction, we assume that X is independent in N. This means that $H[X]$ contains no balanced cycles, and any connected component of $H[X]$ contains at most one cycle. Let us assume for a contradiction that X is dependent in $\mathrm{Amal}(M, M')$. In fact, we can assume that X is a circuit of $\mathrm{Amal}(M, M')$. As N is an amalgam, it follows that neither $X \cap E(M)$ nor $X \cap E(M')$ is dependent, so X is contained in neither $E(M)$ nor $E(M')$. One of the three statements in Proposition 4.1 must hold.

We prove the following statements for M and M' simultaneously, by letting $\{M_1, M_2\}$ be $\{M, M'\}$.

Claim 5.2.1. *The subgraph $H[X - E(M_1)]$ either contains a connected component that contains both u_1 and u_{s+1}, or a connected component that contains either u_1 or u_{s+1} and a cycle.*

Proof. Assume 5.2.1 is false, so that any component of $H[X - E(M_1)]$ contains at most one of u_1 and u_{s+1}, and any component containing one of these vertices contains no cycle. This means that if p and q are distinct elements of ℓ, then $H[(X - E(M_1)) \cup \{p, q\}]$ contains no balanced cycles, and no theta graphs or handcuffs. From this it follows that $\mathrm{cl}_{M_2}(X - E(M_1))$ does not contain any element of ℓ, so statement (iii) of Proposition 4.1 does not hold. Moreover, $r_{M_2}((X - E(M_1)) \cup \ell) = r_{M_2}(X - E(M_1)) + 2$. As one of the three statements in Proposition 4.1 must hold, it follows that ℓ is in $\mathrm{cl}_{M_2}(X \cap E(M_2))$ and $r_{M_1}((X - E(M_2)) \cup \ell) < r_{M_1}(X - E(M_2)) + 2$. But this now means that X contains at least two elements of ℓ, or else $\ell \nsubseteq \mathrm{cl}_{M_2}(X \cap E(M_2))$. Hence $\ell \subseteq \mathrm{cl}_{M_2}(X \cap \ell)$, so Proposition 4.1 implies that $X \cap E(M_1)$ is dependent in $\mathrm{Amal}(M, M')$. Since X is a circuit of $\mathrm{Amal}(M, M')$, this means that $X \subseteq E(M_1)$, contrary to hypothesis. Therefore 5.2.1 holds. □

Claim 5.2.2. *There is no connected component of $H[X - E(M_1)]$ that contains both u_1 and u_{s+1}.*

Proof. Assume that H_0 is such a component. Then H_0 is contained in a connected component, H_1, of $H[X \cap E(M_2)]$. If H_1 contains a cycle, then by applying 5.2.1 to $H[X-E(M_2)]$, we can deduce that the union of H_1 with a component of $H[X - E(M_2)]$ contains a theta graph or a handcuff. We have assumed that X contains no such subgraph, so this is a contradiction. Therefore H_1 contains no cycle, from which we deduce that $X \cap \ell = \emptyset$ and that $H[X-E(M_1)]$ is a path from u_1 to u_{s+1}. Note that $H[(X-E(M_1))\cup a]$ contains no circuit of M_2, so ℓ is not in $\mathrm{cl}_{M_2}(X - E(M_1))$.

If there is a component of $H[X-E(M_2)]$ that contains u_1 and u_{s+1}, then by the reasoning in the previous paragraph, $H[X - E(M_2)]$ is a path from u_1 to u_{s+1}, and $\ell \not\subseteq \mathrm{cl}_{M_1}(X - E(M_2))$. Therefore $H[X]$ is a Hamiltonian cycle, and the only statement in Proposition 4.1 that can hold is statement (iii). We have noted that a (and by symmetry b) is not in $\mathrm{cl}_{M_2}(X-E(M_1))$, so there is an edge, w, joining u_1 and u_{s+1}, such that w is in both $\mathrm{cl}_{M_2}(X - E(M_1))$ and $\mathrm{cl}_{M_1}(X - E(M_2))$. This means that $H[(X - E(M_1)) \cup w]$ and $H[(X - E(M_2)) \cup w]$ are both balanced cycles. Thus the product of edge labels on the path $H[X - E(M_2)]$ is the inverse of the product on the path $H[X - E(M_1)]$ (assuming that we travel in a consistent direction around the Hamiltonian cycle $H[X]$). Hence X is a balanced cycle, a contradiction. Therefore no component of $H[X - E(M_2)]$ contains u_1 and u_{s+1}.

Recall that $X \cap \ell = \emptyset$ and neither a nor b is in $\mathrm{cl}_{M_2}(X - E(M_1))$. As one of the statements from Proposition 4.1 must hold, either there is an edge between u_1 and u_{s+1} that is in both $\mathrm{cl}_{M_2}(X-E(M_1))$ and $\mathrm{cl}_{M_1}(X-E(M_2))$, or $\mathrm{cl}_{M_1}(X - E(M_2))$ contains ℓ. Therefore in either case we can let w be an edge between u_1 and u_{s+1} that is in $\mathrm{cl}_{M_1}(X - E(M_2))$. Let C be a circuit of M_1 contained in $(X - E(M_2)) \cup w$ that contains w. No component of $H[X-E(M_2)]$ contains u_1 and u_{s+1} so $H[C-w]$ is not connected. It follows that $H[C]$ is a handcuff, and w is an edge in the path between the two cycles. Therefore $H[X-E(M_2)]$ contains two distinct components, each containing a cycle and one of u_1 and u_{s+1}. As $H[X - E(M_1)]$ is a path from u_1 to u_{s+1}, it follows that $H[X]$ is a handcuff, a contradiction. This completes the proof of 5.2.2. □

We have shown that neither $H[X - E(M)]$ nor $H[X - E(M')]$ contains a component that contains u_1 and u_{s+1}. By using 5.2.1, symmetry, and the fact that X contains no handcuffs, we can assume the following: there is a component of $H[X - E(M_2)]$ that contains u_1 and a cycle, and any component that contains u_{s+1} contains no cycle; similarly, there is a component of $H[X - E(M_1)]$ that contains u_{s+1} and a cycle, and any component that contains u_1 contains no cycle. It follows from this assumption (and the fact that $H[X]$ contains no handcuffs) that $X \cap \ell = \emptyset$. Notice that a is the only element in

$$\mathrm{cl}_{M_1}(X - E(M_2)) \cap \ell = \mathrm{cl}_{M_1}(X \cap E(M_1)) \cap \ell.$$

Similarly, $\mathrm{cl}_{M_2}(X \cap E(M_2)) \cap \ell = \{b\}$. Therefore none of the statements in Proposition 4.1 can hold, so we have a contradiction.

Now it follows that if X is independent in N it is also independent in $\mathrm{Amal}(M, M')$, so $N = \mathrm{Amal}(M, M')$, exactly as desired. □

Lemma 5.3. *Let $\mathbb{K}$ be a field and let s and t be distinct integers satisfying $s, t \geq 3$. Let α be an element in $\mathbb{K} - \{0\}$ with order greater than $\max\{s, 2t(t-1)\}$. Let M be $M(\Gamma(\mathbb{K}, s, \alpha))$ and let M' be $M(\Delta(\mathbb{K}, t, \alpha))$. Then $\mathrm{Amal}(M, M')$ is not representable over any field.*

Proof. Let us assume that the matrix D represents $\mathrm{Amal}(M, M')$ over the field $\mathbb{L}$. Let B be the set $\{a_2, \ldots, a_s, a, b, c_2, c_3, \ldots, c_{2t-1}\}$. Thus B is the set of all loops in $\Gamma(\mathbb{K}, s, \alpha)$ and $\Delta(\mathbb{K}, t, \alpha)$. It is clear that $B \cap E(M)$ and $B \cap E(M')$ are independent in M and M', and moreover, $r_M((B - E(M')) \cup \ell) = r_M(B - E(M')) + 2$ and $r_{M'}((B - E(M)) \cup \ell) = r_{M'}(B - E(M)) + 2$. Now it follows easily from Proposition 4.1 that B cannot be dependent in $\mathrm{Amal}(M, M')$. If e is any element of the ground set of $\mathrm{Amal}(M, M')$ that is not in B, then $B \cup e$ contains a circuit of either M or M', and this circuit has cardinality three. From this it follows that B is a basis of $\mathrm{Amal}(M, M')$. We can assume that the columns of D labelled by the elements of B form a identity matrix. As the fundamental circuits relative to B all have cardinality three, every column of D contains either one or two non-zero elements. By scaling, we can assume that the first non-zero entry in each column is 1. Thus $D = D(G, \sigma)$, for some gain graph (G, σ) over the field $\mathbb{L}$. By examining the fundamental circuits relative to B, we see that G is the graph in Figure 2. By scaling rows of D, we can assume that $\sigma(x_i, u_i, u_{i+1}) = 1$ for each $i = 1, \ldots, s$ and $\sigma(e_i, v_i, v_{i+1}) = 1$ for each $i = 1, \ldots, 2t-1$. For $i \in \{1, \ldots, s\}$, let α_i be $\sigma(y_i, u_i, u_{i+1})$ and for $i \in \{1, \ldots, 2t-1\}$, let β_i be $\sigma(f_i, v_i, v_{i+1})$. Let γ, δ, ϵ, and ζ be $\sigma(x, u_1, u_{s+1})$, $\sigma(y, u_1, u_{s+1})$, $\sigma(z, u_1, u_{s+1})$, and $\sigma(g, u_1, u_{s+1})$.

Because $\{x_1, \ldots, x_s, x\}$ is a balanced cycle in $\Gamma(\mathbb{K}, s, \alpha)$, and hence a circuit in $\mathrm{Amal}(M, M')$, it follows that it is also a balanced cycle in (G, σ). This means that $\gamma = 1$. Next we notice that $(\{y_1, \ldots, y_s\} - y_i) \cup \{x_i, y\}$ is a balanced cycle of $\Gamma(\mathbb{K}, s, \alpha)$ and hence of (G, σ), for any i in $\{1, \ldots, s\}$. The product of edge labels on this cycle is $\alpha_1 \cdots \alpha_s \alpha_i^{-1} \delta^{-1}$, which implies that $\alpha_i = \alpha_1 \cdots \alpha_s \delta^{-1}$ for any $i \in \{1, \ldots, s\}$. This in turn implies that $\alpha_i = \alpha_j$ for any $i, j \in \{1, \ldots, s\}$ and that $\delta = \alpha_1^{s-1}$. As $\{y_1, \ldots, y_s, z\}$ is a balanced cycle, it follows that $\epsilon = \alpha_1^s$.

Next we observe that $(\{e_1, \ldots, e_{2t-1}\} - e_i) \cup \{f_i, y\}$ is a balanced cycle in $\Delta(\mathbb{K}, t, \alpha)$, and hence in (G, σ), for any $i \in \{1, \ldots, t\}$. Thus $\beta_i = \delta = \alpha_1^{s-1}$ for any such i. Similarly, $(\{e_1, \ldots, e_{2t-1}\} - e_i) \cup \{f_i, z\}$ is a balanced cycle for any $i \in \{t+1, \ldots, 2t-1\}$, from which we deduce that $\beta_i = \epsilon = \alpha_1^s$.

As $\{f_1, \ldots, f_t, e_{t+1}, \ldots, e_{2t-1}, g\}$ and $\{e_1, \ldots, e_t, f_{t+1}, \ldots, f_{2t-1}, g\}$ are both balanced cycles, it now follows that the products $\beta_1 \cdots \beta_t = (\alpha_1^{s-1})^t$ and $\beta_{t+1} \cdots \beta_{2t-1} = (\alpha_1^s)^{t-1}$ are both equal to ζ. Thus $\alpha_1^{st-t} = \alpha_1^{st-s}$, implying $\alpha_1^s = \alpha_1^t$. Let o be the order of α_1 in $\mathbb{L}$. Since $s \neq t$, we know that



FIGURE 2. The gain graph (G, σ).

$o < \max\{s, t\}$. But if $o < s$, then $\{y_1, \ldots, y_o, x\}$ is a balanced cycle in (G, σ), although it is not a circuit in M. Therefore $o < t$. Now the product of edge labels on the cycle $\{f_1, \ldots, f_o, e_{o+1}, \ldots, e_{2t-1}, x\}$ is $(\alpha^{s-1})^o = 1$, so this is a balanced cycle in (G, σ), although not a circuit in M'. This contradiction proves the lemma. □

6. Proof of Lemma 1.4

This section is dedicated to proving Lemma 1.4. The main ideas required here are essentially identical to those in Section 3, so we omit many details.

We again let k be a fixed positive integer; a registry is again a $(k+2) \times k$ matrix with rows indexed by Ind, Sing, and $X_1, \ldots, X_k$, and columns indexed by $X_1, \ldots, X_k$. As before, an entry in row X_i is either 'T' or 'F', and an entry in row Sing is either '<', '=', or '>'. However, in this case, an entry in row Ind is either 'F', or an ordered pair from the set

$$\{\mathrm{T}, \mathrm{F}\} \times \{\ell, a, b, x, y, z, \emptyset, \mathrm{skew}\}.$$

It follows that there are at most $2^{k^2} 3^k 17^k = g_2(k, 0)$ possible registries.

A depth-0 tree is a registry, and a depth-$(i+1)$ tree is a non-empty set of depth-i trees, so there are no more than $f_2(k)$ depth-k trees. Assume that M is either a hoop matroid, $M(\Gamma(\mathbb{K}, s, \alpha))$, or a loop matroid, $M(\Delta(\mathbb{L}, t, \beta))$, for some choices of fields, $\mathbb{K}$ and $\mathbb{L}$, integers $s, t \geq 3$, and elements $\alpha \in \mathbb{K} - \{0\}$ and $\beta \in \mathbb{L} - \{0\}$ with orders greater than s and $t(t-1)$ respectively. In the case that M satisfies these conditions, we define an l-stacked matroid to be a tuple, $(M, Y_1, \ldots, Y_l)$, where $0 \leq l \leq k$ and each Y_i is a subset of the ground set of M.

If $\mathcal{M} = (M, Y_1, \ldots, Y_k)$ is a k-stacked matroid, then $\mathcal{T}(\mathcal{M})$ is a registry. The entry in row X_i and column X_j of this registry is 'T' if and only if

$Y_i \subseteq Y_j$. The entry in row Sing and column X_i is '<', '=', or '>', according to whether $|Y_i|$ is less than, equal to, or greater than one. The entries in row Ind are more complicated. Let ℓ be $\{a, b, x, y, z\}$. Consider the entry in row Ind and column X_i. If Y_i is dependent in M, then the entry is 'F'. Assume that Y_i is independent. Then the entry is an ordered pair from $\{\mathrm{T}, \mathrm{F}\} \times \{\ell, a, b, x, y, z, \emptyset, \text{skew}\}$. The first component in this pair is 'T' if and only if $\ell \subseteq \mathrm{cl}_M(Y_i)$. The second component is determined by the interaction between $\mathrm{cl}_M(Y_i - \ell)$ and ℓ. If $\ell \subseteq \mathrm{cl}_M(Y_i - \ell)$, then the entry is ℓ. Assume that $\mathrm{cl}_M(Y_i - \ell)$ contains at most one element of ℓ. If it contains, respectively, a, b, x, y, or z, then the entry in $\mathcal{T}(\mathcal{M})$ is, respectively, a, b, x, y, or z. Now assume that $\mathrm{cl}_M(Y_i - \ell) \cap \ell = \emptyset$. If $r_M(Y_i \cup \ell) < r_M(Y_i - \ell) + 2$, then we set the entry in $\mathcal{T}(\mathcal{M})$ to be $\emptyset$. Otherwise we set it to be 'skew'. When $l < k$, and $\mathcal{M} = (M, Y_1, \ldots, Y_l)$ is an l-stacked matroid, we define $\mathcal{T}(\mathcal{M})$ to be $\{\mathcal{T}(M, Y_1, \ldots, Y_l, Y_{l+1})\colon Y_{l+1} \subseteq E(M)\}$.

The set of matrices, $\mathcal{B}$, is exactly as described in Section 3, so that a quantifier-free formula in k variables is a function from $\mathcal{B}$ to $\{\mathrm{T}, \mathrm{F}\}$. We produce the sum of two registries as before, by summing entry by entry. The rule for summing in a row labelled by Sing or by X_i is the same as before, but we need to define the rule for summing entries in the Ind row. Let ω_1 and ω_2 be elements of

$$\{\mathrm{F}\} \cup (\{\mathrm{T}, \mathrm{F}\} \times \{\ell, a, b, x, y, z, \emptyset, \text{skew}\}).$$

We will describe ω, the sum of ω_1 and ω_2. If either ω_1 or ω_2 is 'F', then ω is 'F'. Assume that ω_1 and ω_2 are both ordered pairs from $\{\mathrm{T}, \mathrm{F}\} \times \{\ell, a, b, x, y, z, \emptyset, \text{skew}\}$. If the first component of ω_1 (respectively, ω_2) is 'T', then ω is 'F' if and only if the second entry in ω_2 (respectively, ω_1) is not equal to 'skew'. Now assume that the first components of ω_1 and ω_2 are both equal to 'F'. Then ω is 'F' if and only if ω_1 and ω_2 have identical second components, and this component is a, b, x, y, or z.

The summing operation we have just described has been designed to align with the conditions in Proposition 4.1.

Proposition 6.1. *Assume that M and M' are, respectively, $M(\Gamma(\mathbb{K}, s, \alpha))$ and $M(\Delta(\mathbb{L}, t, \beta))$, and let $\mathcal{M} = (M, Y_1, \ldots, Y_k)$ and $\mathcal{M}' = (M, Y_1', \ldots, Y_k')$ be k-stacked matroids. Then $\mathcal{T}(\mathcal{M})$ and $\mathcal{T}(\mathcal{M}')$ are registries. In the sum of these registries, the entry in row* Ind *and column X_i will be* 'T' *if and only if $Y_i \cup Y_i'$ is independent in* $\mathrm{Amal}(M, M')$.

Proof. This is immediate from the definition of $\mathcal{T}(\mathcal{M})$ and $\mathcal{T}(\mathcal{M}')$, the definition of the summing operation, and Proposition 4.1. □

Now we assume $\psi = Q_{l+1}X_{l+1}Q_{l+2}X_{l+2}\cdots Q_kX_k\ \psi'$ is a formula in prenex form with k variables, l of which are free. Thus ψ' is a quantifier-free formula. The definition of two depth-$(k-l)$ trees being compatible relative to ψ is identical to that in Section 3, except that we use the new summing operation for registries when we define the compatability of depth-0 trees.

We can now use Proposition 6.1 to prove the following proposition in exactly the same way that we proved Proposition 3.1.

Proposition 6.2. *Assume that M and M' are, respectively, $M(\Gamma(\mathbb{K}, s, \alpha))$ and $M(\Delta(\mathbb{L}, t, \beta))$, and let $\mathcal{M} = (M, Y_1, \ldots, Y_l)$ and $\mathcal{M}' = (M, Y_1', \ldots, Y_l')$ be l-stacked matroids. The l-stacked matroid*

$$(\mathrm{Amal}(M, M'), Y_1 \cup Y_1', \ldots, Y_l \cup Y_l')$$

satisfies ψ if and only if the trees, $\mathcal{T}(\mathcal{M})$ and $\mathcal{T}(\mathcal{M}')$, are compatible relative to ψ.

Lemma 1.4 follows immediately.

We can now complete the proofs of Theorem 1.2 and Corollary 1.5.

Proof of Theorem 1.2. Let $\mathbb{K}$ be an infinite field. Assume that $\psi_{\mathbb{K}}$ is a sentence in MS_0 characterising $\mathbb{K}$-representable matroids. Let k be $|\mathrm{Var}(\psi_{\mathbb{K}})|$. We claim that $\mathbb{K}$ contains non-zero elements with arbitrarily large order. Let $o(\alpha)$ be the order of the non-zero element α. If $o(\alpha)$ is bounded above by the integer K, for every non-zero α, then every non-zero element of $\mathbb{K}$ is a root of the polynomial $(x^K - 1)(x^{K-1} - 1) \cdots (x - 1)$. Since there are only finitely many such roots, $\mathbb{K}$ is finite. This contradiction proves our claim.

We let $P_1, \ldots, P_{N_2(k)}$ be the blocks provided by Lemma 1.4. Choose the element $\alpha \in \mathbb{K} - \{0\}$ so that there are at least $N_2(k) + 1$ integers, s, satisfying $s \geq 3$ and $2s(s-1) < o(\alpha)$. Then there are two distinct integers, s and t, satisfying these constraints, such that $M = M(\Gamma(\mathbb{K}, s, \alpha))$ and $M' = M(\Gamma(\mathbb{K}, t, \alpha))$ are contained in the same block. We let M'' be $M(\Delta(\mathbb{K}, s, \alpha))$. Then Lemma 1.4 implies that $\psi_{\mathbb{K}}$ is satisfied by either both of $\mathrm{Amal}(M, M'')$ and $\mathrm{Amal}(M', M'')$, or neither. However, the first of these amalgams is $\mathbb{K}$-representable by Lemma 5.2, and the second is not representable over any field at all, by Lemma 5.3. This contradiction completes the proof of the theorem. □

Proof of Corollary 1.5. Let us assume that N is an integer such that for any finite field, $\mathbb{F}$, there is a sentence, $\psi_{\mathbb{F}}$, in MS_0 such that $|\mathrm{Var}(\psi_{\mathbb{F}})| \leq N$, and a matroid is $\mathbb{F}$-representable if and only if it satisfies $\psi_{\mathbb{F}}$. Recall that if $\mathbb{F}$ is a finite field, then the multiplicative group of $\mathbb{F}$ has an element of order $|\mathbb{F}| - 1$. Choose $\mathbb{F}$ so that there are least $f_2(N) + 1$ integers, s, satisfying $s \geq 3$ and $2s(s-1) < |\mathbb{F}| - 1$. Let α be a generator of the multiplicative group of $\mathbb{F}$, and let $\psi_{\mathbb{F}}$ be a sentence with $k \leq N$ variables that characterises $\mathbb{F}$-representability. Let $P_1, \ldots, P_{N_2(k)}$ be the blocks provided by Lemma 1.4. As $f_2(N) \geq f_2(k) \geq N_2(k)$, there are distinct integers, s and t, such that $s, t \geq 3$ and $2s(s-1), 2t(t-1) < |\mathbb{F}| - 1$, and $M = M(\Gamma(\mathbb{K}, s, \alpha))$ and $M' = M(\Gamma(\mathbb{K}, t, \alpha))$ belong to the same block. Now we obtain a contradiction from Lemmas 5.2 and 5.3 exactly as before. □

7. Acknowledgements

We thank Noam Greenberg for helpful advice. The research in this article was supported by the Rutherford Discovery Fellowship, the Marsden Fund of New Zealand, and NSERC Canada.

References

[1] H.-D. Ebbinghaus and J. Flum. *Finite model theory*. Springer Monographs in Mathematics. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, enlarged edition (2006).
[2] J. Geelen. Some open problems on excluding a uniform minor. *Adv. in Appl. Math.* **41** (2008), no. 4, 628–637.
[3] J. Geelen, B. Gerards, and G. Whittle. Solving Rota's conjecture. *Notices Amer. Math. Soc.* **61** (2014), no. 7, 736–743.
[4] L. Libkin. *Elements of finite model theory*. Texts in Theoretical Computer Science. An EATCS Series. Springer-Verlag, Berlin (2004).
[5] D. Mayhew, M. Newman, and G. Whittle. Is the missing axiom of matroid theory lost forever? *Q J Math* **65** (2014), no. 4, 1397–1415.
[6] A. Nerode. Linear automaton transformations. *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.* **9** (1958), 541–544.
[7] J. Oxley. *Matroid theory*. Oxford University Press, New York, second edition (2011).
[8] P. Vámos. The missing axiom of matroid theory is lost forever. *J. London Math. Soc. (2)* **18** (1978), no. 3, 403–408.
[9] H. Whitney. On the abstract properties of linear dependence. *Amer. J. Math.* **57** (1935), no. 3, 509–533.
[10] T. Zaslavsky. Biased graphs. IV. Geometrical realizations. *J. Combin. Theory Ser. B* **89** (2003), no. 2, 231–297.

School of Mathematics, Statistics and Operations Research, Victoria University of Wellington, New Zealand
E-mail address: dillon.mayhew@msor.vuw.ac.nz

Department of Mathematics and Statistics, University of Ottawa, Ottawa, Canada
E-mail address: mnewman@uottawa.ca

School of Mathematics, Statistics and Operations Research, Victoria University of Wellington, New Zealand
E-mail address: geoff.whittle@msor.vuw.ac.nz